

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of October 26, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 19, 28-34 and 36 were rejected, and Claims 20-27 were objected to. With this Amendment, Claims 20, 28 and 32 are amended, Claim 19 is cancelled, and Claims 20-36 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claims Pending

The Office Action indicated that claims 19-34 and 36 are pending in this application. Claim 35, however, was not the subject of Applicant's Appeal and was indicated as Allowable Subject Matter in the Office Action of April 16, 2003, and is also pending. Claim 35 was presented in Applicant's Amendment after final of July 16, 2003. Claim 35 is indicated in Applicant's appeal briefs as "allowable but objected to". Claim 35 is therefore pending, and presented for allowance.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Baba ('162). With this Amendment, Claims 19 is cancelled. Claim 32 is amended to include method limitations that are comparable to apparatus limitations in allowable Claim 20. Claim 32, as presently amended, includes limitations to providing a controller gain that is adapted in a fixed range as a function of adaptive parameter data. Baba does not disclose providing a controller gain that is adapted in a fixed range as a function of adaptive parameter data. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of Claim 32, as presently amended, are therefore requested.

In the Office Action, Claim 19, 28-34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (US 6,583,964). As indicated above, Claim 19 is cancelled and Claim 32 is amended to include limitations to providing a controller gain that is adapted in a fixed range as a function of adaptive parameter data. Claim 28 is amended to include limitations to providing a controller gain that is adapted in a fixed range as a function of adaptive parameter data. Claims 28 and 32, as well as dependent Claims 29-31, 33, 34, 36 are thus

believed to be novel. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of Claims 28-34, 36 are therefore requested.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as over Baba ('162) in view of Clare et al. ('286). Claim 36 depends from Amended Claim 32. Claim 32, as presently amended, includes limitations to providing a controller gain that is adapted in a fixed range as a function of adaptive parameter data. Claim 36 adds additional limitations to the output being coupled to a voice coil motor in a disc drive. The limitations of Claim 36 when taken in combination with the limitations of amended Claim 32 are believed to be non-obvious and patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of Claim 36 is therefore requested.

Allowable Subject Matter


The Examiner objected to Claims 20-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. With this Amendment, Claim 20 is amended as suggested by the Examiner. Allowance of Claim 20 and dependent Claims 21-27 are therefore requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above comments and remarks, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

David C. Bohn, Reg. No. 32,015  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DCB/elk